B.   REMARKS

The Examiner is thanked for the performance of a thorough search. No claims have been canceled or added in this reply. Hence, Claims 1-11, 13 and 14 are pending in this application. The amendments to the claims do not add any new matter to this application. All issues raised in the Final Office Action mailed December 26, 2007 are addressed hereinafter.

REJECTION OF CLAIMS 1-6, 8-11 AND 14 UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)

In the Final Office Action, Claims 1-6, 8-11 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by *Miida*, U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0049839. It is respectfully submitted that Claims 1-6, 8-11 and 14, as amended, are patentable over *Miida* for at least the reasons provided hereinafter.

<div align="center">CLAIM 1</div>

Claim 1, as amended, is directed to an apparatus for processing network device status data and recites:

"a storage device comprising configuration data stored thereon, wherein the configuration
        data indicates both:
        a data format supported by each of a plurality of recipient devices, wherein the
              data format supported by each of the plurality of recipient devices is
              different than the data formats supported by the other recipient devices
              from the plurality of recipient devices, and
        how to convert network device status data that conforms to a first data format into
              each of the data formats supported by the plurality of recipient devices;
    a conversion mechanism configured to
        process the network device status data that conforms to the first data format, and
        generate, based upon the configuration data and the network device status data,
              report data that conforms to the data format supported by each of the
              plurality of recipient devices, wherein the report data includes
              identification data that uniquely identifies an intended recipient device so
              that the report data may be routed to each recipient device from the
              plurality of recipient devices."

The apparatus for processing network device status data recited in Claim 1 includes a storage device and a conversion mechanism. The storage device includes configuration data that indicates a data format supported by each of a plurality of recipient devices. The data format

supported by each of the plurality of recipient devices is different than the data formats supported by the other recipient devices from the plurality of recipient devices. The configuration data also indicates how to convert network device status data that conforms to a first data format into each of the data formats supported by the plurality of recipient devices. The conversion mechanism is configured to process the network device status data and generate, based upon the configuration data and the network device status data, report data that conforms to the data format supported by each of the plurality of recipient devices. Also, the report data includes identification data that uniquely identifies an intended recipient device so that the report data may be routed to each recipient device from the plurality of recipient devices.

As suggested by the Examiner in the recent Office Action, the claims have been amended to more clearly recite that the data format supported by each recipient device is different that the data formats supported by the other recipient devices from the plurality of recipient devices. It is therefore respectfully submitted that Claim 1, as amended, is distinguishable over *Miida* on the basis that *Miida* does not teach or suggest converting status data into specific data formats supported by recipient devices, where the data formats are different for each recipient device. In *Miida* the data provided to the terminals 500 is all in the same format and there is no indication that any terminal-specific data formatting occurs. The information may be presented to users via either email or Web pages at each terminal 500, but all of the terminals support email and Web pages. There is no indication that the terminals 500 support different data formats or that center 100 converts data into specific formats supported by specific terminals 500 that are different than the formats supported by other terminals 500. Furthermore, there is no indication that center 100 stores configuration data that indicates both a data format supported by each terminal 500 and how to convert status data from a first data format into the data format supported by each terminal 500. It is therefore respectfully submitted that the Claim 1 limitations "a storage device comprising configuration data stored thereon, wherein the configuration data indicates both a data format supported by each of a plurality of recipient devices, wherein the data format supported by each of the plurality of recipient devices is different than the data formats supported by the other recipient devices from the plurality of recipient devices, and how to convert network device status data that conforms to a first data format into each of the data formats supported by the plurality of recipient devices" and "a conversion mechanism configured to process the network device status data that conforms to the first data format, and generate,

based upon the configuration data and the network device status data, report data that conforms to the data format supported by each of the plurality of recipient devices" are not taught or suggested by *Miida*.

In addition to the foregoing, there is also no indication in *Miida* that the information supplied by center 100 to terminals 500 includes "identification data that uniquely identifies an intended recipient device so that the report data may be routed to each recipient device from the plurality of recipient devices." Note that the identification data is included in the report data so that the report data can be routed to each recipient device from the plurality of recipient devices. *Miida* describes the typical components of a terminal 500 and also how each terminal 500 is used by individuals registered in the customer-ID database 22. The customer-ID database 22 stores IDs of users and not terminals 500. There may be multiple users for each terminal 500 and each user may use multiple terminals 500. The IDs of Miida therefore cannot be used to route status information to particular terminals 500. It is therefore respectfully submitted that the Claim 1 limitation "identification data that uniquely identifies an intended recipient device so that the report data may be routed to each recipient device from the plurality of recipient devices" is also not taught or suggested by *Miida*.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that Claim 1, as amended, recites one or more limitations that are not taught or suggested by *Miida* and is therefore patentable over *Miida*.

CLAIMS 2-6, 8-11 AND 14

Claims 2-6, 8-11 and 14 all depend from Claim 1 and include all of the limitations of Claim 1. It is therefore respectfully submitted that Claims 2-6, 8-11 and 14 are patentable over *Miida* for at least the reasons set forth herein with respect to Claim 1. Furthermore, it is respectfully submitted that Claims 2-6, 8-11 and 14 recite additional limitations that independently render them patentable over *Miida*.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that Claims 1-6, 8-11 and 14 are patentable over *Miida*.

REJECTION OF CLAIM 7 UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

In the Final Office Action, Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Miida* in view of *Krishnaprasad et al.*, U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0099687 (hereinafter "*Krishnaprasad*"). It is respectfully submitted that Claim 7 is patentable over *Miida* and *Krishnaprasad* for at least the reasons provided hereinafter. Claim 7 depends from Claim 1 and includes all of the limitations of Claim 1. As previously set forth herein, Claim 1 includes one or more limitations that are not taught or suggested by *Miida*. It is respectfully submitted that these limitations are not taught or suggested by *Krishnaprasad* and it is understood that the *Krishnaprasad* reference was not relied upon for teaching or suggesting these limitations, but rather the additional limitations of Claim 7 relating the XML schema conversion. It is therefore respectfully submitted that Claim 7 is patentable over *Miida* and *Krishnaprasad*.

REJECTION OF CLAIM 13 UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

In the Final Office Action, Claim 13 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Miida* in view of *McGlade*, U.S. Patent No. 6,411,598. It is respectfully submitted that Claim 13 is patentable over *Miida* and *McGlade*, considered alone or in combination, for at least the reasons provided hereinafter.

Claim 13 depends from Claim 1 and includes all of the limitations of Claim 1. As previously set forth herein, Claim 1 includes one or more limitations that are not taught or suggested by *Miida*. It is respectfully submitted that these limitations are not taught or suggested by *McGlade* and it is understood that the *McGlade* reference was not relied upon for teaching or suggesting these limitations, but rather the additional limitations of Claim 13 relating to providing a notification if a receipt confirmation indicating receipt of the report data is not received from a particular recipient device. It is therefore respectfully submitted that Claim 13 is patentable over *Miida* and *McGlade*.

CONCLUSION

It is respectfully submitted that all of the pending claims are in condition for allowance and the issuance of a notice of allowance is respectfully requested. If there are any additional charges, please charge them to Deposit Account No. 50-1302.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if the Examiner believes that such contact would be helpful in furthering the prosecution of this application.

Respectfully submitted,

HICKMAN PALERMO TRUONG & BECKER LLP

/EdwardABecker#37777/

Edward A. Becker
Reg. No. 37,777
Date: **March 10, 2008**

2055 Gateway Place, Suite 550
San Jose, CA 95110
(408) 414-1204
Facsimile: (408) 414-1076